



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/518,873

12/20/2004

Jochen Fink

PP/1-22699/A/CGM

3532

324

7590

09/19/2006

515/PCT

EXAMINER

MULLIS, JEFFREY C

CIBA SPECIALTY CHEMICALS CORPORATION
PATENT DEPARTMENT
540 WHITE PLAINS RD
P O BOX 2005
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591-9005

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1711

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/518,873

Applicant(s)

FINK ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey C. Mullis

Art Unit

1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3-17-03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The "R" substituents in claim 1 are undefined and therefore unclear.

ABS and ASA are not block copolymers as the term is ordinarily used in the art and as logically used and it is therefore unclear what is intended in at least claim 3.

The term "polyolefin copolymers" implies copolymers of polyolefinic units (ie block copolymers) such as the specification appears not to disclose which would lead those skilled in the art to question whether "olefin copolymers" are intended as set out in at least claim 2.

At least claim 7 shows a structure B prime with a dot (or possibly not as it is not entirely legible) as part of the N-O bond which is not art recognized.

Those skilled in the art when viewing the second species in line 2 of claim 14 would realize that methyl cation is highly unstable especially in the presence of oxide ion and question what is really intended.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants specification does not enable the production of the species with the second moiety of line 3 of claim 14 as nothing is disclosed how to make it.

Applicants temperature range is not disclosed by EP 02405514.7 and the effective filing date of the instant case is therefore 6-12-03.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saldivar et al. (US 2004/0077788).

Patentees in paragraph 167 disclose the blending of various thermoplastics in an extruder at the temperatures of 220-270 degrees centigrade with styrene/maleic anhydride copolymer made by polymerization in the presence of TEMPO. Note paragraph 31 disclosing graft polymer formation during melt blending.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Robert (US 5,945,492).

Patentees disclose a process in which polyethylene is grafted with maleic anhydride in the presence of TEMPO (Examples 5-10) in various zones Z1-Z8 at temperatures of 150-280 degrees centigrade. As the minimum zone temperature is 150 degrees centigrade and, within the range of that of applicants it would reasonably appear that at least some polymerization occurs by the beginning of the second zone (encompassing applicants step B). With re to applicants "thermoplastic" or "elastomeric" polymer of claim 1, it is widely known in the art that grafting by contact of monomer with polymer results in production of non graft polymer by polymerization of monomer. Note for instance in this re Bertin (US 6,335,401) in the examples thereof discloses production of homopolymer side product even though the backbone polymer is peroxidized which would be expected to increase the efficiency of formation of backbone radicals. In any case claim 21 is drawn to a product not a process.

When the reference discloses all the limitations of a claim except a property or function, and the Examiner cannot determine whether or not the reference inherently possesses properties which anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention, basis exists for shifting the burden of proof to applicant. Note In re Fitzgerald et al. 619 F. 2d 67, 70, 205 USPQ 594, 596, (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § 2112-2112.02.

Product-by-process claims are not rejected using the approach set out in Graham v. Deere. It is applicant's burden to show that there is a non-obvious difference

Art Unit: 1711

between the product of a product-by-process claim and a prior art product which reasonably appears to be the same or only slightly different whether or not the prior art product is produced in the same manner as the claimed product. Note In re Marosi, 218 USPQ 289, 292-293 (CAFC 1983); In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972) and In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985) in this regard.


Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey C. Mullis
M-F, 9-5 pm at telephone number 571 272 1075.

Jeffrey C. Mullis
J Mullis
Art Unit 1711

JCM

9-13-06

JEFFREY C. MULLIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200/71

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke, positioned below the official stamp.